

February 21, 2007

SUBJECT: THE LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

The Land Development Ordinance Committee (LDOC) met Wednesday, February 21, 2007, at 4 p.m., in the second floor Seminar Room located at The Plaza, 100 W. Innes Street, to discuss rewriting Salisbury's ordinance code. In attendance were Jake Alexander, George Busby, Bill Burgin (Co-chair), John Casey, Mark Lewis (Co-chair), Brian Miller, Rodney Queen, Bill Wagoner, and Victor Wallace.

Absent: Karen Alexander, Phil Conrad, Steve Fisher, and Jeff Smith

Staff Present: Bryan Alston, Janet Gapen, Patrick Kennerly, Joe Morris, Dan Mikkelson, Preston Mitchell, Diana Moghrabi, David Phillips, Lynn Raker, Patrick Ritchie

The Meeting was called to order with Bill Burgin (Co-chair) presiding. The minutes of the February 7, 2007, meeting were accepted as published. February 14 the committee did not meet as staff prepared for the City Council Retreat. Staff recapped the events of the Council Retreat for the committee; the LDOC was an item of interest during the retreat. City Council is up-to-date on the status of the new ordinance.

Housekeeping

Joe Morris provided an updated schedule of future meetings. The most current versions of Chapters 7 and 8, with all the requested changes, were distributed. The secretary E-mailed these chapters to members who were not present.

Chapter Summaries

Dan Mikkelson presented the summary on <u>Chapter 9.0</u>, <u>Infrastructure</u>, <u>Platting and Connectivity</u> (Draft 2.19.07). Dan passed out a condensed overview noting the comparison between the Ordinance in place and the one drafted. (Draft 2-21-07)

9.1 Purpose and Intent

Neutral

9.2 Required Improvements A, B & C

More Restrictive

(Consistent with current requirements except addition of open space and the landscape requirements.)

9.3 References Uniform Construction Standards Manual

Neutral

9.4 General Provisions for street design, must upgrade all street fronts.

More Restrictive

There was a discussion about Salisbury not allowing private streets. Dan Mikkelson encouraged the committee not to debate existing standards and not to introduce issues not included in the Salisbury Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan.

9.4 A 1More Restrictive9.4 A 3Neutral9.4 A 4More Restrictive9.4 B TreesMore Restrictive9.4 C Street Markers and Traffic Control SignsNeutral9.4 D SidewalksNeutral (revised)

Comment: DMX, TND 8' wide minimum all others 5' wide minimum

Take a second look at sidewalk requirement in HI and LI. There could be grounds for hardship on "mega properties." Staff will discuss Monday sidewalks for small additions on large properties. City Council has approved the Sidewalk Priority Index Plan and the future of sidewalks being filled in by the City. Sidewalk development during construction needs to happen.

9.4 E Bikeways

Reserve this section to insert the approved comprehensive bicycle plan. Structure is here; developers will accommodate the plan after the City Council debates it.

9.4.F.4

Change terminology of "bulb-out" to infer "large corners."

9.4.H

Curb and gutter based on district.

There was a discussion on grass swales and their benefits. Staff will study it. (Section 15.22)

9.4.I.1

Alleys shall be within privately....insert the word within.

The City is promoting this (alleys) for the first time in decades for lots less than 50' wide because you do not want a drive every 40 feet. (Covered in Chapter 5)

9.4.J

Mark Lewis read the Salisbury Vision 2020 Comprehensive Plan Policy SL-1

Policy SL-1: Streetlights shall be selected and installed according to the design speed and/or intended use of the street or area they serve. Where sidewalks are present or anticipated, pedestrian scaled streetlights shall be preferred.

Staff encourages a higher level of pedestrian-style lighting and the City pays the light bill. The City encourages decorative light fixtures; there was a discussion. See page 2-4 transect (lighting).

Page 9-6 Staff will clarify note 10' or 12' of driveable space.

Example A-curb radius was changed from 20' to 5'.

There was discussion about alleys regarding trash pickup. Should alleys be graveled or paved? It depends on level of service. In commercial alleys of DMX and core area it is important to pave alleys.

9.5.D

This section introduces a new option–linear parks. (See open space chapter.) Bill Burgin proposed a minimum width of 8' and 7' total 15'.

<u>9.5.E</u>

New Option

9.5.F

Current Standard (per transect)

There were no comments from the public, and the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

DM